

REMARKS

Claims 8, 17, 19-25, 28-31 and 33-46 are pending in the application. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that Claims 17, 19-25 and 28-31 are allowed.

Claims 8, 9, 12, 14-16, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakashima et al. (US 6,6774,965) in view of Okamoto et al. (US 2003/0067570) and Baek (US 6,580,480) in view of Sakamoto et al. (US 7,015,996). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Nakashima, Okamoto, Baek and Sakamoto teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 8, 9, 12, 14-16, 26 and 27.

Claim 8 is the independent claim.

Claim 8 claims, *inter alia*, "a reflecting plate formed on the second insulating layer; a second substrate facing the first substrate; and a liquid crystal layer interposed between the first and second substrates and including liquid crystal molecules rubbed along a predetermined direction, wherein the reflecting plate partially overlaps with the second area."

Nakashima teaches a semi-transmissive liquid crystal display device. The semi-transmissive liquid crystal display device includes a reflective electrode 10/11 reflecting outside light and a transmissive electrode 9 transmitting light. The reflective and transmissive electrodes constituting a pixel electrode are formed without having insulating layer there between (see FIG. 9). That is, Nakashima fails to teach or suggest "a reflecting plate formed on the second

insulating layer... wherein the reflecting plate partially overlaps with the second area” as claimed in Claim 8.

Okamoto teaches a liquid crystal display including a reflection display section 9 and a transmission display section 10 (see FIG. 24). The liquid crystal display of Okamoto includes a TFT element 21, a storage capacitor 26, and a capacitor line 27 corresponding to the reflection display section 9 to improve light efficiency. The reflection display section 9 is clearly delineated from the transmission display section 10, with no overlap there between. Therefore, no insulating layer may be formed between the reflection display section 9 and the transmission display section 10 in an area of an overlap.

Baek teaches a transfective liquid crystal display device including a lower substrate 110 and an upper substrate 150 (see FIG. 3). The lower substrate includes a transparent electrode 120 and a reflective electrode 140. The upper substrate 150 includes a passivation layer 160 having a transparent convex portion corresponding to the reflective electrode 140. That is, the transparent convex portion is formed apart from the reflective electrode, on different substrates, with no insulating layer formed there between.

Sakamoto teaches a transfective liquid crystal display device varying liquid crystal layer thickness as a function of liquid crystal layer twist angle. Sakamoto teaches a TFT substrate 11, an opposing substrate 12, and a liquid crystal layer 13. The opposing substrate 12 includes a color layer 26. A thickness of the color layer 26 corresponding to a reflection region is less than a thickness of the color layer 26 corresponding to a transmission region (see FIG. 9). That is, similar to Okamoto, the reflection region is clearly delineated from the transmission region, with no overlap there between. Therefore, no insulating layer may be formed in an area of an overlap between the reflection region and the transmission region.

The combination of Nakashima, Okamoto, Baek and Sakamoto teaches a device including a transmission region and a reflection region with no insulating layer formed there between. Thus, the combination of Nakashima, Okamoto, Baek and Sakamoto does not teach or suggest “a reflecting plate formed on the second insulating layer... wherein the reflecting plate partially overlaps with the second area” as claimed in Claim 8. Therefore, the proposed combination fails to teach or suggest every limitation of Claim 8.

Claims 9, 12, 14-16, 26 and 27 have been canceled. The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakashima, Okamoto, Baek and Sakamoto and further in view of Ha et al. (US 6,704,081).

Claim 13 has been canceled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims 33-40 depend from Claim 8 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 8.

New Claim 41 claims, *inter alia*, “a second insulating layer formed on the first insulating layer and in the first area; a pixel electrode formed on the first insulating layer and connected to the switching device; a third insulating layer formed on the second insulating layer; and a reflecting plate formed on the third insulating layer, wherein the reflecting plate is formed in the first area.”

The combination of Nakashima, Okamoto, Baek, and Sakamoto teaches a device including a reflection region formed on an organic layer (Nakashima), reflection film 8 and an

insulation film 11 separated by electrodes 7 (Okamoto), a reflective electrode 140 formed on an insulation layer 130 (Baek), and a reflective electrode 10 disposed on an insulation layer 8 (Sakamoto). The combination of Nakashima, Okamoto, Baek, and Sakamoto fails to teach or suggest a reflective electrode formed on more than one insulating layer, much less the claimed device having “a third insulating layer formed on the second insulating layer; and a reflecting plate formed on the third insulating layer” as claimed in Claim 41. For example, see FIG. 8 of the present application disclosing an inter-insulating layer 452 formed on the organic insulating layer 444 and the reflecting plate 460 formed thereon. Therefore, the proposed combination fails to teach or suggest every limitation of Claim 41.

Claims 42-46 depend from Claim 41 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 41.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 8, 17, 19-25, 28-31 and 33-46, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 1, 2010

By: /Nathaniel T. Wallace/
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889